

carriage-hire.) April 3, Geo. Stroff, \$10 50; March 31, Horse Price, \$22; April 4, Thorn & Owen, \$17 50; etc., S. W. Blanke, \$65; 30th, M. Shannon, \$100; Wm. Cogswell, for carriage-hire, \$71 54, and other persons, among whom were his two brothers to the amount of \$1,253 28. The checks were made payable to beaver.

Mr. Littlefield had a salary of \$500 per year as Assistant Deputy Collector previous to the 1st of January, 1855, and since that time at the rate of \$800 per year.

The examination will be resumed at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

SUN-STROKES.—A conductor on the Flushing-av. cars named Die-dick Stidman was prostrated by the effects of the heat on Monday, while changing horses at the station foot of Graham st. Remedies were applied, and he recovered.

Harris H. short was sun-struck in Bedford-av., but relief coming too late he died.

John Ritchmiller, residing at the corner of Furman and Doughty-sts., was overcome by the weather and died.

Mary Grisezger, a child residing on the corner of Van Brunt and Union sts., died of the effects of the heat.

Samuel C. Niles, attorney, esp. Elias G. Drake.

To recover \$250, amount of commissions alleged to have been earned by Alvan Beebe, real estate broker, in effecting a sale of property. Mr. Drake (President, &c., of an Insurance Company,) advertised to sell his house No. 269 Fifth av., to exchange it for a farm. Mr. Beebe alleged that he negotiated an arrangement between Mr. Drake and Mr. Anthony J. Blawie to exchange the house and lot, the price to be paid at \$25,000, for a farm of 20 acres. W. C. Thompson Co., belonged to Mrs. Beebe, wife of Mr. B., and that he is entitled to a commission of one per cent. It was denied that Mr. Beebe had been employed by Mr. Drake, &c. Testimony was taken. Judgment for plaintiff, \$250, being 1 per cent.

FIRE DEPARTMENT.—At a recent meeting of the Board of Officers of the Fire Department of the Eastern District, a resolution was adopted directing C. G. of Engineer Talbot to position the Common Comant to prohibit the use of Siamess Butts, and all hose with larger openings than 2½ inches, except the first length for plaintiff, \$250, being 1 per cent.

CASUALTIES.—Christian Constante, in the employ of Peter Stulkenec, as a carman, fell from a cart in Myrtle-av. and was run over. His head was badly cut and his body severely bruised. Officer Martin Fink took him to a drug store in the vicinity and then conveyed him to his residence on the corner of De Kalb-av. and Houston-st.

A gas fitter, in the employ of the Brooklyn Gas Co., while engaged yesterday in repairing a main in Court-st., was knocked down by the horses of a rail car and the wheel grazed his head. His injuries are of a serious nature.

COLLISION.—Yesterday morning a collision occurred in Fulton-st., near Con-f, between car No. 99 of the Fulton Line and a farm wagon driven by Mr. John Weyoff of Jamaica. The wagon was on the track in front of the car, but did not succeed in getting out of the way soon enough, and the vehicles came in contact, whereby both were badly damaged. A little boy named George P. McCleane, son of Sergeant McCleane of the Third District Police, was in the car at the time, and having his arm hanging out of the window, his hand was dreadfully mashed and one of his fingers nearly severed. He was conveyed to Dr. Ayres' office, where the finger was amputated. The accident is to be investigated before Justice Curtis.

STARING WITH A BAYONET.—John Johnson, who was stabbed with a bayonet on Tuesday night by Hugh Mooney, while passing his house in Columbian-st., is represented as being in a precarious condition and not likely to recover. The assailant was drunk at the time, and it is said made the assault on account of an old grudge.

BRUTALITY.—Officer Miner, of the Fifth District, arrested a man named Pethiger yesterday, on a charge of beating his wife in a brutal manner while intoxicated. He was held for examination before Justice Jacobs.

AN IMPPOSTOR.—A man of tall stature, wearing a white felt hat and tight clothing, has recently been defrauding some of the miliners and dress-makers in South Brooklyn by representing himself as the agent of a book of fashion plates named "The English." He induced several ladies to come in advance to the amount of \$2 25 apiece, but the book was not forthcoming. He gave his name as James Martin, residing at No. 412 Atlantic-st., but it appears that a butcher shop occupies that site. Mrs. Lyons, No. 3 Van Buren-st., is one of those who was defrauded in this manner.

BURGLARY.—The residence of the Rev. Seymour Langdon, corner of Grand and Ewens-sts., has been burglariously entered within a few days the family being absent. It is not known what articles have been taken.

COURT OF SESSIONS.—Jacob Zizibeen, tried in this Court for assault and battery on Jacob Lutcher, intent to kill, was convicted of simple assault, and in consequence of extenuating circumstances the Jury unanimously recommended him to mercy. John Gossard, a young pianist and Michael Gandy (boy) were indicted for robbery in the first degree. It appears that they shot another boy, named Wm. Perine, of a gold watch by knocking him down and gagging him. Perine, it was also shown, stole two gold watches of which this was one, from Charles Ambraser, No. 141 Ewens-st., on the 2d of May last. On his return home he was met by the accused boys and robbed. They were convicted, but in consequence of their youth, and having been imprisoned since May, they were discharged with an admonition from the Court. Bridge Barker, convicted of stealing a gold watch from Anthony O. Truett, was sentenced to the State Prison for two years.

NEW-JERSEY ITEMS.

THE HEAT.—In the Jersey City Ferry-House yesterday afternoon the thermometer stood at 101° in the shade. Those at work in exposed positions suspended labor, or acted with caution, and no cases of sunstroke were reported.

EXCURSION.—A party of about two hundred residents of Jersey City went on an excursion on Wednesday afternoon, on the steamboat Sun and a barge. Leaving the Canal wharf at 3 o'clock, the party proceeded to Washington Grove, above Fort Lee, where there was dancing in the grove. Returning at dark, a brilliant display of fireworks took place under the direction of Mr. Isaac Edge of Jersey City, in honor of Mr. D. S. Gregory. The works were fired opposite Mr. Gregory's country residence, and made beautiful light. The boat then proceeded down the bay and returned at about 2 o'clock yesterday morning. Shelton's Band was on board, and dancing was kept up during the trip.

BASE BALL CLUB.—The Excelsior Base Ball Club of Jersey City was permanently organized last evening. Geo. E. Cutler was elected President; Isaiah Hutton, Vice-President; Benj. Haines, Secretary; and Levi Towle, Treasurer. This Club already numbers over twenty members. On Thursdays and Fridays they will play at Hamilton-square, in the Fourth Ward, commencing at 4 o'clock, P. M.

—Three large wooden buildings in West Hoboken, occupied as dwellings, and as shoe-store, boot-shop and place where camphene and burning fluids were sold, were destroyed by fire at 7 o'clock last evening.

LA W INTELLIGENCE.

MARINE COURT.—July 19.—Before Judge McCARTHY.—Allied Total, at the Piano-forte.

Plaintiff, we believe, keeps a kind of loan furniture and other articles) established at No. 11 Chamberlain-st. Mr. S. is a piano-forte dealer in Broadway. The present charge is that Mr. S. came to the premises of plaintiff, having with him a horse and cart, and two or three men, and insisted upon removing by force a piano-forte which was on the premises and belonged to plaintiff, and that latter had to exercise force to prevent it. He brings action for alleged trespass, damages laid at \$500.

In defense it was said that defendant and his brother hired out to Miss Miller the piano-forte in question, who to pay a certain sum for its use, and to keep it on his premises where she resided; that the brother understood the wood had come by some means into possession of plaintiff, and went to his establishment in the morning and demanded that plaintiff remove by force the piano-forte which was on the premises and belonged to plaintiff, and that latter had to exercise force to prevent it. His brother was called to the stand and deposed that he was at the piano-forte dealer's, and that he had been to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

Plaintiff, however, had plaintiff refused to give it up, the brother went to the store of Mr. S. and the brother went to the establishment, but the piano-forte never came to him.

</div